

July 1, 1976

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

H 7173

disciplined to be effective. With a self-generating momentum of its own it simply keeps on growing—and as it grows in size it grows more impersonal and indifferent as well.

Unfortunately, Washington, to date, has been satisfied with talk and precious little else:

President Nixon, years ago, bemoaned the proliferation and longevity of regulatory agencies. He cited the Tea Tasting Commission as a good example. But it is now 5 years later and the Tea Tasting Commission still exists.

President Ford, last November, appointed a Presidential commission to advise him on how to reduce the number and minimize the intrusions of the regulatory agencies. But that commission still has yet to meet.

Government agencies print about 10 billion sheets of paper a year to be completed by U.S. businesses—enough to fill more than 4 million cubic feet of space.

The annual volume of daily logs filed by truckers, as required by the ICC, if placed end to end, would circle the Earth twice or reach 43,085 miles into space.

The public's anger and the politician rhetoric are met with bureaucratic indifference and such absurdities as a 64-page OSEA regulation on what is a safe ladder, an effort to impose expensive air bags on the automobile industry, and a constant expansion of Washington's triplicate form mentality.

Congress can act, but it has not. I am asking the people of Michigan for a mandate to blow the whistle on Washington's bureaucracy by congressional action on the following seven acts:

First. Before the Congress starts to reform the bureaucracy, it must put its own house in order. We need to rationalize the committee structure. A major reason for confusion in the Government is that the Congress itself is confused. When an issue like energy—which requires a coordinated national policy—is assigned to at least seven different committees, it is little wonder that we do not have a rationalized policy. We demand that all other agencies open their books for audit, but refuse to open our own. We cannot continue to tolerate fiscal irresponsibility in the Congress and must immediately approve my bill to require a yearly audit, to be made public, of all congressional financial records.

Second. A bill to freeze civil service hiring for 1 year. If it were practical I would like it extended to political appointees also, but should there be a new administration it should have the right to pick its own people. I happen to believe that most jobs done by six people would probably be more effectively done by five. Reducing the size of Government by attrition is a minimum requirement to get Washington working again.

Third. Legislation that permits the dismissal of incompetent civil servants. The merit hiring of civil service was a welcome improvement on the evils of political patronage. But when Government affects so much in the daily lives of our citizens, a civil service without the capacity to dismiss lazy or incompetent Government employees is intolerable. We all know that there are thousands and thou-

sands of hard-working and competent civil servants. But sadly, we also know that Government employment has, all too often, become a haven for tired minds. I believe it is time to adapt some type of selection-out process. The private sector does not tolerate incompetence. There is no reason that the American taxpayers should do so.

Fourth. A sunset, zero-based budgeting law by which every regulatory agency and each Government program would exist for only a prescribed number of years. This would require Congress to act to renew an agency if it was going to continue. The Congress should ask "Is this program essential; and, if it is essential, is it effective." The result should be that agencies whose reason for existence has died would also die. And agencies who have become adversaries against the people rather than their servants would have to answer for their action. It would curtail the self-generating momentum of Government and reduce the tendency of regulatory agencies to play God with the people.

Every agency should be required to answer the following questions: Is the program necessary; is it worth what it costs; does it work. If each agency would answer each of those questions we would have far better, and far less, government.

Fifth. The establishment of a Congressional Oversight Week each month when agencies and departments would be required to appear on the floor of the House and the Senate to answer questions about the administration of their programs. Based on the "Question Day" of the British and Canadian parliamentary systems, this would insure that Congress took an active and vital part in overseeing the Government. This proposal, which I first made in 1968, would bring the big bureaucracy closer to the people. It would be important, in such oversight questioning to call not only the heads of agencies, but on those who actually operate the programs as well. Talking to Secretaries and Assistant Secretaries is not enough. We need to talk to the men who actually undertake the programs. They are the ones who know where the problems lie and the ones who now, are so often unresponsive to the will of the Congress and the people because they are so far removed from them.

Sixth. A congressional resolution which puts us on record as being unwilling to approve the fiscal 1978 appropriation for any department or agency which has not cut its authorized Government forms by a minimum of 10 percent in the previous year. If it takes the fear of fiscal chaos to force the bureaucracy to respond, then I think Congress should extend the warning and follow through.

Seventh. A 50-percent reduction in the budget of the Government Printing Office. If there is one regular symbol of the ills of our Government it is the semi-monthly publication list of the Government Printing Office. It is not just that much of the material is silly, unnecessary, ludicrous and/or wrong. (My favorite was a bulletin which

warned me that "hazards can be dangerous.") More important, the American taxpayers, and that includes me, are paying for someone, somewhere, to dream up the idea, someone to research it, someone to write it, someone to rewrite it, someone to edit it, someone to approve it, someone to set it in type, someone to proofread it, someone to illustrate it, someone to print it, someone to collate it, someone to staple it, someone to catalog it, someone to distribute it, someone to store it, and a lot of someones to file it. If we turn off the printing press, we just might bring the bureaucracy to its knees.

Some may say none of this will work. I say what alternative do we have to trying?

Some may say it is not Congress responsibility but the executive's. I say that the executive really does not do very much that we have not started.

Some may say this is unimportant compared to jobs and health care and education. I agree, but a government which can not handle the programs it has now can not handle anything new any better. We should impose a moratorium on the passage of new governmental programs. We must make the present Government work better before we launch off in a hundred new directions.

First things must come first. And all our good intentions for government to serve human needs are meaningless if we do not put the Government's house in order.

I am asking Michigan for a mandate to blow the whistle of bloated government, beginning with Congress itself. And I am asking you to do the same in your campaigns. Then, maybe Washington will have earned the people's trust again.

NOW, WHAT ABOUT REAL REFORM?

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. ANDERSON) is recognized for 30 minutes.

Mr. ANDERSON—of Illinois. Mr. Speaker, now that the Democrats have been zapped into action by the infamous Ray-gun, the time would seem to be ripe for us to get down to the brass-tacks of doing some real reforming around this House. Any attempt to portray the caucus proposals for a little book-juggling and commission studying as a reform panacea for our tarnished image and sagging prestige, must be viewed as a joke, and a poor one at that.

Mr. Speaker, at the beginning of this Congress, my counterpart on the Democratic side of the aisle, the caucus chairman (Mr. PHILLIP BURTON) was quoted as saying "the winds of change have arrived in the House of Representatives." A retrospective testing of those winds will reveal that they have grown stale, vapid and malodorous. The 94th was dubbed in the press as being a "reform minded" Congress. While I do not question what some may have had in "mind," I do know that very little in the way of meaningful reform has actually been implemented in this Congress. The "reform" tag was apparently the result of the ability of the

caucus to depose three chairmen—though it also reversed the Steering and Policy Committee recommendation by reinstating Chairman Hays—and give more power and autonomy to our proliferating subcommittees. These so-called reforms have actually brought us to the sorry state in which we find ourselves today—less public and legislative accountability than ever before. The aim of the reformers was to break up the committee baronies perpetuated by the seniority system. And yet, what we have gotten in their place is 150 subcommittee fiefdoms—up from 132 subcommittees in the last Congress—with powers and responsibilities spread all over the lot, and layers upon layers of overlapping jurisdictions. The term, "confusing, gerry-built hodgepodge" is much more applicable to our existing committee and subcommittee maze than it is to the 14 House accounts examined by the Democratic Task Force on Accounts. If one is really interested in improving accountability in the House, as that task force was charged with doing, then he should look to our antiquated and dilapidated committee structure.

Mr. Speaker, while subcommittees can play a valuable role in terms of increasing Member participation in the process, developing expertise and initiatives on a broader range of issues, and sharpening oversight of executive branch agencies and programs, their irrational, uncoordinated and free-wheeling proliferation can also work to the detriment of the legislative process. It is perhaps ironic that Elizabeth Ray was successfully stashed away as a staffer on an oversight subcommittee—which she appropriately referred to as the "out-of-sight" subcommittee—the very subcommittee that was supposed to be overseeing other House committees and subcommittees.

This brings us to the question, "What about real reform in the House?" And the fact is, most major reforms remain pigeonholed in various House committees. The reform failings of the 94th Congress constitute a major scandal which has not yet been exposed, let alone dealt with.

COMMITTEE REORGANIZATION

In the 93d Congress we created a bipartisan select committee on committees to examine our committee system and make recommendations for change. It reported back early in 1974 with a comprehensive set of proposals for realigning committee jurisdictions along more functional and rational lines, limiting Members to one major committee assignment, and providing for a jurisdictional appeal mechanism. The Democratic Caucus sat on that resolution for 6 months, then offered up a watered-down substitute that did little more than protect existing turf while forcing multiple referral of bills to committees which would continue to have overlapping jurisdictions. The result: In this Congress more committees are taking more time to report more versions of the same bills to a more confused and overburdened House than ever before. We are witnessing this nearly every week in the Rules Committee and on the House floor. Instead of

leadership and coordination we are being served the most indigestible smorgasbord imaginable. And even though section 205 of the committee reform amendments adopted by the House in October of 1974 assigned the House Members on the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations the responsibility of conducting a continuing review of committee jurisdictions, including the mandate to periodically report recommended changes to the Rules Committee, nothing further has been done about committee reform in this Congress.

INTELLIGENCE OVERSIGHT

One of the major issues to confront this Congress has been the abuse of power by our foreign and domestic intelligence community. Both Houses conducted extensive hearings into this through select committees, and both select committees, plus two outside commissions, have recommended improved oversight of the intelligence community by the Congress. While the other body has proceeded to establish such a new oversight mechanism, numerous proposals in the House to follow suit continue to languish in the Rules Committee.

HOUSE BROADCASTING

Last year the Committee on Rules created an Ad Hoc Subcommittee on Broadcasting to further study the recommendation of the Joint Committee on Congressional Operations for broadcasting our floor proceedings. Early this year the subcommittee reported a resolution providing for continuous broadcast coverage of our sessions. Under intense pressure from the Democratic leadership, that resolution was recommitted to subcommittee. The reason: Majority leadership fears that the cameras might reveal to the public how they really run things around here.

PROXY VOTING

One of the recommendations of the Select Committee on Committees in the last Congress was the complete elimination of proxy voting in committees. The so-called Hansen substitute of the Democratic Caucus restored this irresponsible form of absentee voting to our House rules. The justification: since the caucus substitute failed to rationalize our committee jurisdictions, balance Members' workload and confine each Member to one major committee, the proxy practice had to be continued since Members would still have to be voting in several committees simultaneously. Last year I introduced a rules amendment to abolish proxy voting, with some 91 cosponsors. That resolution continues to languish in the Rules Committee.

SENDING PARTY INSTRUCTIONS

While the Democratic Caucus has dropped its rule permitting the caucus to bind its Members' floor votes, it may still issue binding instructions with respect to committee votes. And that is just what the caucus did to its House Administration Committee members in requiring that they unilaterally create a new consolidated slush fund. Last year I introduced an amendment to the House Rules to prohibit binding party instructions, and

Members' committee and floor votes, with 90 cosponsors. That resolution is still bottled up in the Rules Committee.

PERSONAL FINANCIAL DISCLOSURE

A major reform proposal, the Financial Disclosure Act (H.R. 3249) was introduced by Congressmen KASTENMEIER and STEELMAN, with numerous House cosponsors, back on February 19, 1975. The bill would require full public financial disclosure by high officials of the legislative, executive, and judicial branches, as well as candidates for Federal elective office, on an annual basis. As a cosponsor of that legislation I am extremely disappointed that the bill is still lying dormant in a subcommittee of the Judiciary Committee. This is one of the major Watergate Reform recommendations and is deserving of consideration and approval in this Congress.

LOBBY DISCLOSURE

Our present lobby law is antiquated, meaningless, and unenforceable. Major legislation has been introduced in both Houses to tighten up on the lobby law and require more comprehensive disclosure and enforcement. While this legislation passed the Senate by a vote of 82 to 9 on June 15, 1976, it was only reported from the House Judiciary subcommittee on June 17, and must still clear that full committee as well as the Committee on Standards of Official Conduct. The prospects for enactment of a lobby reform bill in this Congress grow dimmer as adjournment grows closer.

MEMBERS' SALARIES

While much to do is being made of the Democratic Caucus' belated endorsement of the Bauman amendment to require a House vote on any future increases in Members' office allowances, little mention is made of the fact that there will still be automatic cost-of-living increases in these same allowances without a House vote. But, more importantly, no mention is made of several pending bills to repeal the automatic cost-of-living salary increase for Members; I am cosponsoring one such bill with Congressman HYDE. Nor is any mention made of another worthwhile proposal I am cosponsoring with Congressman MOSHER which would not only require a House vote on any future salary increases, but specify that such increases could not take effect in the same Congress in which they are voted. This latter proposal would give the voters a chance to pass judgment on whether the increases are justified, just as it will give Members an opportunity to take their case to the voters and defend any increase they may have supported.

OTHER REFORMS

Many other worthy reforms have been introduced in this Congress and yet have gone nowhere. I have in mind, for instance, some of the other "open House amendments" I first introduced in February of 1975. These include making all nonclassified records of committee actions available to public inspection—at present only rollcall votes need be open to inspection; require that all committee meetings be open under the same conditions which apply to committee

July 1, 1976

Approved For Release 2004/12/20 : CIA-RDP79M00467A000400030028-5

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD HOUSE

H 7175

hearings; permit any member of a committee to demand a rollcall vote on any issue, and require a rollcall vote on all measures reported from a committee; prohibit any closed House-Senate conferences; and permit the House, at the beginning of each Congress to fully debate and amend the proposed House rules for that Congress, instead of the present procedure of voting up or down, en bloc, the entire package of rules recommended by the majority party caucus.

Finally, I would mention my more recent resolution to permit a House majority to require the House ethics committee to undertake an investigation into alleged misconduct by any Member on a properly filed complaint or resolution of punishment, if it does not initiate an investigation on its own within a specified period after receiving the complaint or resolution; at present the House Rules state that an investigation may only be undertaken by majority vote of that bipartisan 12-member committee, thus precluding the House from acting responsibly on its constitutional responsibility to punish its own Members. I have also recently introduced with Congressman JOHN BURTON a rule to deny House floor privileges to former House Members who are employed for the purpose of influencing legislation.

All of the above reforms which I have just listed, plus many others introduced by other Members of this body, are stalled in the House Rules Committee which does not even have a permanent subcommittee on original jurisdiction or reform to consider whether some of these reform proposals might have merit. I think it is quite evident where the blame for the reform failings of the 94th Congress lies. For if, as it is widely stated, the Rules Committee is an arm of the Democratic leadership, then it would follow that the majority leadership is responsible for blocking reform and maintaining the status quo in this House. If the Democratic leadership is under any illusion that the American people are going to be bought off by some accounts juggling and commission study delays in the name of reform, it is sadly mistaken. The public will soon learn that the real House scandal is the reform coverup being perpetrated by various House committees and subcommittees, by direction or with the approval of the Democratic leadership.

THE FLIGHT OF SERGEJ KUSHIM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Illinois (Mr. DERWINSKI) is recognized for 5 minutes.

Mr. DERWINSKI. Mr. Speaker, all the nations which signed the Helsinki agreement pledged to do everything possible to reunite families separated by political boundaries. However, the Soviet Union is not abiding by that promise. One of the more tragic cases involves a family from the Ukraine who live in my congressional district. Their story is one which I want to bring to the Members attention.

Sergej Kushim, 57, presently living in Rokitnoye, U.S.S.R., has been trying for

the past 12 years to get exit permission from the Soviet Government to visit his mother and sister in La Grange Park, Ill. The Soviet authorities have refused, stating that his health prevents him from traveling to the United States; nevertheless, they have assigned him to manage a dairy. He is, by profession, a trained orchestral conductor. Kushim, the rest of whose family emigrated to the United States in 1949, is ill with gastric cancer and has been told that he has less than a year to live.

To compound this tragic situation, his mother, Donna Kushim, who is 82 years old and whom he has not seen in 38 years, is also very ill, suffering from diabetes melitus and the suspicion of cancer. She is being cared for by Mr. Kushim's sister, Dr. Lydia Kolomijew, a practicing physician who is doing everything she can to reunite her family. She could provide her brother with better medical care than he is receiving in the Soviet Union.

Dr. Kolomijew says her mother keeps a portrait of Sergej on a table and each morning kisses it, saying "Hello, my dear son." She is becoming more despondent, waiting for the time when she can see him again.

Mr. Speaker, I have sent a number of letters and cables to Soviet Ambassador to the United States Anatoly Dobrynyn and Soviet Foreign Minister Andrei Gromyko urging humanitarian consideration of Mr. Kushim's case, but I have not received the courtesy of a single reply. I have also asked our Ambassador in Moscow Walter Stoessel to request reconsideration of this case by the Soviet authorities, but his efforts have been of no avail.

Last week Sergej Kushim was turned down again for the 11th time for exit permission by Soviet authorities. I wonder if Secretary Kissinger can explain if there is any consistency between this Soviet action and the Helsinki accords.

THE REALITIES OF FOOD STAMP REFORM

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Kansas (Mr. SEBELIUS) is recognized for 15 minutes.

Mr. SEBELIUS. Mr. Speaker, two or three votes. That is all it would take for the Committee on Agriculture to write a meaningful food stamp reform bill. Two or three votes.

The Committee on Agriculture has been tied up with food stamp markup since May 12. After 7 weeks we have covered 16 pages of a 46-page bill, only about half of which deal with basic policy issues. On June 29 the committee decided to continue after the Democratic Convention. Sometime this summer the committee may or may not report a food stamp bill. But, even if we do, it now looks like it will not reform; that is, cure abuse of the food stamp program. It will merely make cosmetic changes. The committee lacks two or three votes, on virtually every major issue, to replace legislative rouge and lipstick with the basic program change necessary to eliminate abuse.

The food stamp debate has been most costly. It has been costly in terms of the time and effort of the members of the committee. It has been costly in terms of diverting the committee from important agricultural issues, such as forestry, peanuts, and other legislation. And the food stamp debate has been costly in that the lax eligibility rules and sloppy program administration that started the controversy more than a year ago will not be solved as a result of our actions.

Early this year the Congress was informed that some of the agencies and organizations that sell food stamps to recipients had lost, stolen, or misused some \$34 million in Federal funds. The Congress unanimously approved the Emergency Food Stamp Vendor Accountability Act of 1976 to solve the problem. This is a good piece of legislation, but one that does not deal with basic program policy issues. Two or three votes are preventing the Committee on Agriculture from taking the same swift and decisive action on the larger issue of food stamp reform. As pointed out some months ago by the distinguished gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) the committee has touched the mechanics and it has touched the details, but it has not come to grips with the fundamentals. At the current pace, we will go home in October having manicured the nails of a gangrenous foot.

Let me give you some examples.

On April 28 the gentleman from Texas (Mr. POAGE) introduced a responsible food stamp reform bill: legislation which would have restored equity and perspective to the food stamp program, and which would have brought Federal spending into line with the agriculture appropriations bill passed by the House. On May 6 the gentleman from Washington (Mr. FOLEY) also introduced a food stamp bill. As introduced, the Foley bill would have increased program costs by \$300 million and compounded existing program deficiencies by placing into law many of the bureaucratic regulations that caused the mess in the first place. The committee was faced with a simple choice between using a reform bill as the vehicle for food stamp markup or using a bill that merely tinkers with and adds to existing problems. On May 12 the committee voted by a margin of 22 to 19 to tinker rather than reform. Had only two members changed their vote, the committee would be marking up the Poage bill; but that did not happen, and we are not.

Advocates of the Foley bill insist that the legislation authored by Mr. Poage cut too deep; and that the Foley bill would be paired down through the amendment process, but this has not happened to any significant degree. For example, Federal bureaucrats recently developed a thrifty diet plan, which the diet plan used to determine how many food stamps participating households get. The thrifty plan is so liberal that 17 percent of all dollars are spent for accessory items—things like cooking wine and ice cubes. The thrifty plan even budgets for junk food such as Coke and potato chips, because Federal "nutritionists" think this is an appropriate

Approved For Release 2004/12/20 : CIA-RDP79M00467A000400030028-5

CONGRESSIONAL RECORD—HOUSE

July 1, 1976

and believe we should exhaust all possible measures to live in harmony with other governments. But, when the vote is cast to choose freedom or totalitarianism in other countries, our vote must always be freedom—and we must stay strong enough to defend that position.

In conclusion, may I as an American citizen commend the many of you who have labored long and hard to preserve our liberties and to build a better America. I challenge, however, those of you who have taken the easy Primrose Path. You have tried to curry favor with your constituents for your own self-gain. You have worked harder to be reelected than you have worked to do your job. It is not too late to change, however—to review—to take a new look—a new direction.

America needs statesmen! We so urgently need elected officials dedicated morally and spiritually who will look to the future. We need men of character and integrity who will to the best of their ability, take our country on the course that will preserve our freedoms and rededicate us to the most meaningful objective Americans can have—to secure the blessings of liberty to ourselves and to our posterity.

My concerns go beyond these few issues. But, there must be a start. This is the starting place. Let us, for our common good and mutual salvation, get started.

This is one citizen's way—my way—of saying, "Happy Birthday, America!"

Happy Birthday today, and Happy Birthday on July 4, 2076.

RESULTS OF OHIO'S 17TH DISTRICT OPINION POLL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the results of my 16th annual opinion poll have been tabulated. The response was tremendous. In addition to the completed questionnaires, I received thousands of letters, comments and notes included in the polls.

One area that was of increased concern was Government spending. About 90 percent of those answering the poll thought the Congress should place a limit on Federal spending. When a cut in services was suggested as going with a cut in Federal spending, 83 percent still favored a cut in spending.

Since last year's poll, the number of people viewing inflation as a more serious problem than unemployment has grown to 73 percent. Also, the individuals responding were heavily in favor of encour-

aging private enterprise to provide more jobs while only a small percentage favored the alternative of greater Federal spending to create more jobs.

In foreign policy and defense areas the results were also interesting. A large 77 percent of those responding thought détente was benefiting the Communist countries, at the expense of the United States. Almost 80 percent were in favor of substantially reducing or eliminating U.S. contributions to the United Nations. On the Panama Canal issue 89 percent think the United States should maintain sovereignty, ownership and management of it.

On the issue of firearms the results are very interesting, for 65 percent opposed registration of firearms while 30 percent favored such a policy.

In addition to the above questions a large number of other areas of public policy were covered. Questions on public employee strikes, Child and Family Services, energy and environment, amnesty, and social security also were included.

I appreciate the efforts of all those who took the time to fill out the questionnaire and give me their views. The results of the poll follow:

1976 PUBLIC OPINION POLL OF THE 17TH DISTRICT OF OHIO

(Results in percent)

	Yes	No	No opinion		Yes	No	No opinion
1. The most serious economic problem facing our Nation at this time is:				10. The social security fund is in financial trouble. To deal with this problem I would prefer—			
(a) Inflation	73			(a) Increasing the social security tax	30		
(b) Unemployment	22		5	(b) Holding a lid on social security benefits	58		
No opinion				No opinion			12
2. What policy do you favor to lessen unemployment?				11. Do you favor the position of public employees (police, firemen, teachers, etc.) when they say they should be allowed to strike?	25	70	5
(a) Encourage private enterprise through tax incentives to create jobs	84			12. The supersonic transport (SST) should be allowed to land in the United States:			
(b) Greater Federal spending to create jobs	10		6	(a) Without restrictions	9		
No opinion				(b) On a limited, trial basis only	53		
3. I think the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) should be:				(c) Not at all	29		
(a) Abolished	7			No opinion			8
(b) Retained as is	22			13. Do you favor relaxing environmental standards to allow greater use of coal, of which the United States has a large supply, as a means of lessening our energy problems?	68	15	3
(c) Retained, but with greater congressional oversight	42			14. Do you favor increased development of nuclear energy as a domestic power source?	75	17	8
(d) Retained with greater Presidential oversight	25			15. U.S. contributions to the United Nations should be:			
No opinion				(a) Increased	2		
4. To what extent would you favor capital punishment for a limited number of major crimes?				(b) Left the same	16		
(a) Strongly favor	75			(c) Substantially reduced	58		
(b) Favor	14			(d) Eliminated	25		
(c) Strongly oppose	4			No opinion			3
(d) Oppose	4			16. What do you think of Secretary of State Kissinger's performance in office?			
No opinion			3	(a) Good	29		
5. Do you favor registration of firearms as a means of combating crime?	30	65	5	(b) Fair	44		
6. What do you feel is the major reason for the serious crime rate which is steadily increasing?				(c) Poor	23		
(a) Leniency of the courts and the judicial system	82			No opinion			3
(b) Easy availability of firearms	2			17. Do you think détente has benefited the Communist countries at the expense of the United States?	77	17	11
(c) Social conditions which contribute to crime, especially among minority groups and economically deprived citizens	14			18. Do you favor unconditional amnesty for Vietnam draft evaders?	16	80	4
No opinion			5	19. Should the United States follow a policy of military superiority over the Soviet Union?	84	10	6
7. Should Congress approve the Child and Family Services Act, which would establish a new, comprehensive child development program run by the Federal Government?	11	21	8	20. Should the United States maintain sovereignty, ownership, and management of the Panama Canal?	89	9	7
8. Should Congress place a ceiling on Federal spending?	90	5	5				
9. Do you favor a cut in Federal Government spending if this also means a cut in services?	83	12	5				

IT IS TIME FOR A CHANGE

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Michigan (Mr. ESCH) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ESCH. Mr. Speaker, a significant part of our Nation's governmental process is the exchange of views which takes place during campaigns and elections. It is through this political process that the American people have approved for the direction that their government will take

in the years ahead. Therefore, in the months ahead, I shall be spending the majority of my time talking with the people of Michigan. I shall be asking them for a mandate—a mandate to change things in Washington.

We all know that the people are angry at Washington. What we do not seem to realize is that this Congress perpetuates that anger by giving only lip service to change. The Congress has changed from hot air to action.

Each of us from different regions of the country, with different socioeconomic perspectives, has our own pet legislation. To some it is jobs, to others health care, to still others energy development or education or consumer protection.

The basic problem is that this Government of ours could not administer the new programs any better than it has the old. It is too swollen to be efficient, too distant to be understanding, and too un-

RESULTS OF OHIO'S 17TH DISTRICT OPINION POLL

The SPEAKER pro tempore. Under a previous order of the House, the gentleman from Ohio (Mr. ASHBROOK) is recognized for 10 minutes.

Mr. ASHBROOK. Mr. Speaker, the results of my 16th annual opinion poll have been tabulated. The response was tremendous. In addition to the completed questionnaires, I received thousands of letters, comments and notes included in the polls.

One area that was of increased concern was Government spending. About 90 percent of those answering the poll thought the Congress should place a limit on Federal spending. When a cut in services was suggested as going with a cut in Federal spending, 83 percent still favored a cut in spending.

Since last year's poll, the number of people viewing inflation as a more serious problem than unemployment has grown to 73 percent. Also, the individuals responding were heavily in favor of encour-

aging private enterprise to provide more jobs while only a small percentage favored the alternative of greater Federal spending to create more jobs.

In foreign policy and defense areas the results were also interesting. A large 77 percent of those responding thought détente was benefiting the Communist countries at the expense of the United States. Almost 80 percent were in favor of substantially reducing or eliminating U.S. contributions to the United Nations. On the Panama Canal issue 29 percent think the United States should maintain sovereignty, ownership and management of it.

On the issue of firearms the results are very interesting, for 65 percent opposed registration of firearms while 30 percent favored such a policy.

In addition to the above questions a large number of other areas of public policy were covered. Questions on public employee strikes, Child and Family Services, energy and environment, amnesty, and social security also were included.

I appreciate the efforts of all those who took the time to fill out the questionnaire and give me their views. The results of the poll follow:

1976 PUBLIC OPINION POLL OF THE 17TH DISTRICT OF OHIO

[Results in percent]

	Yes	No	No opinion		Yes	No	No opinion
1. The most serious economic problem facing our Nation at this time is:				10. The social security fund is in financial trouble. To deal with this problem I would prefer:			
(a) Inflation.....	73			(a) Increasing the social security tax.....	34		
(b) Unemployment.....	22			(b) Holding a lid on social security benefits.....	58		
(c) No opinion.....			5	(c) No opinion.....			12
2. What policy do you favor to lessen unemployment?				11. Do you favor the position of public employees (police, firemen, teachers, etc.) when they say they should be allowed to strike?	25	70	5
(a) Encourage private enterprise through tax incentives to create jobs.....	84			12. The supersonic transport (SST) should be allowed to land in the United States:			
(b) Greater Federal spending to create jobs.....	40			(a) Without restrictions.....	9		
(c) No opinion.....			6	(b) On a limited, trial basis only.....	53		
3. I think the Central Intelligence Agency (CIA) should be:				(c) Not at all.....	29		
(a) Abolished.....	7			(c) No opinion.....			4
(b) Retained as is.....	22			13. Do you favor relaxing environmental standards to allow greater use of coal, of which the United States has a large supply, as a means of lessening our energy problems?	80	15	5
(c) Retained, but with greater congressional oversight.....	42			14. Do you favor increased development of nuclear energy as a domestic power source?	75	17	8
(d) Retained with greater Presidential oversight.....	25			(a) Increased.....	2		
(e) No opinion.....			4	(b) Left the same.....	16		
4. To what extent would you favor capital punishment for a limited				(c) Substantially reduced.....	54		
(a) Strongly favor.....	75			(d) Eliminated.....	28		
(b) Favor.....	14			(e) No opinion.....			3
(c) Strongly oppose.....	4			15. What do you think of Secretary of State Kissinger's performance in office?			
(d) Oppose.....	4			(a) Good.....	29		
(e) No opinion.....			3	(b) Fair.....	41		
5. Do you favor registration of firearms as a means of combating crime?	30	55	5	(c) Poor.....	27		
6. What do you feel is the major reason for the serious crime rate which is steadily increasing?				(d) No opinion.....			3
(a) Leniency of the courts and the judicial system.....	82			17. Do you think détente has benefited the Communist countries at the expense of the United States?	77	12	11
(b) Easy availability of firearms.....	2			18. Do you favor unconditional amnesty for Vietnam draft evaders?	15	59	4
(c) Social conditions which contribute to crime, especially among minority groups and economically deprived citizens.....	14			19. Should the United States follow a policy of military superiority over the Soviet Union?	84	13	6
(d) No opinion.....			5	20. Should the United States maintain sovereignty, ownership, and management of the Panama Canal?	59	4	7
7. Should Congress approve the Child and Family Services Act, which would establish a new, comprehensive child development program run by the Federal Government?	11	81	8				
8. Should Congress place a ceiling on Federal spending?	90	5	5				
9. Do you favor a cut in Federal Government spending if this also means a cut in services?	83	12	5				

QUESTIONNAIRE

HON. JAMES T. BROYHILL

OF NORTH CAROLINA

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES

Wednesday, June 30, 1976

Mr. BROYHILL. Mr. Speaker, earlier this year, I distributed a public opinion poll in the district I represent. The results of this questionnaire are of great assistance to me as I seek to represent the views and interests of my constituents.

This year, over 12,000 persons responded to 11 questions which dealt with important foreign and domestic issues such as the future of the Panama Canal and alternative ways to insure the financial solvency of the social security system. In addition, I also sent questionnaires to a number of high schools in the district, so that I might secure a significant sampling of the views of graduating high school seniors. It is interesting to note the difference of opinion between the high school students and the general adult population.

The question which generated the strongest response dealt with the subject of continued American ownership and control of the Panama Canal. Over 95 percent of the general population and 88 percent of the student responses favored the United States retaining control of the canal and the Canal Zone. I have introduced legislation in support of continued U.S. sovereignty and jurisdiction over the Canal Zone and believe the response of my constituents points out the need for this legislation.

There was also a near unanimity of opinion among my constituents—students as well as adults—in their belief that Federal judges should be appointed for a term of years rather than for life. I have introduced legislation to amend the Constitution to provide that Federal judges be reappointed and reconfirmed by the Senate every 8 years. I believe this to be a responsible and logical approach to solving the problem of judicial accountability, which is of great concern to the American public.

In response to a question regarding postcard voter registration, 80 percent of adults agreed that individuals should be required to register in person before appropriate election officials to be eligible to vote, while 52 percent of the high school students opposed postcard voter registration.

Responding to a question about a national health insurance program, only 35 percent of the adults favored a national health insurance plan financed by higher payroll taxes. Differing sharply with the adult population, the students showed support for such a plan.

Questions 6 and 10 dealt with overseas intelligence operations and the CIA. Over 92 percent of the general population and 80 percent of the students favored continued American intelligence operations overseas. The students nar-

rowly favored public disclosure of intelligence operations and expenditures, while the adult respondents opposed full disclosure by roughly 3 to 1.

A resounding "no" was registered by my constituents in response to a question on whether the Federal Government should provide jobs to anyone who wants to work but cannot find employment. The students were almost equally divided on this issue. I believe this response from my constituents is especially significant in light of the efforts currently in the Congress on behalf of the controversial Humphrey-Hawkins bill.

The adult respondents this year registered overwhelming opposition to the Federal Government legalizing the use of marihuana. The student respondents opposed marihuana legalization also, although by a much more narrow margin.

An issue which is increasingly before the public is whether or not public employees, such as teachers, firemen, and policemen, should have the right to strike. It is interesting to note that students solidly favored the right of public employees to strike, while the adults opposed strikes which could endanger the public welfare by a 4 to 1 margin.

Although students favored legislation requiring handgun owners to register their firearms, almost 60 percent of the adult population opposed firearms registration. It is clear that there is disagreement among all age groups as to the best way to reduce the disturbing increase in gun-related crimes. I have sponsored legislation which would require mandatory prison terms for anyone convicted of using a firearm in the commission of a felony, because I believe the best deterrent to criminal use of firearms is swift and sure punishment.

The final question dealt with the future funding of the social security program. About one-half of those responding believe that the social security fund should be replenished on a "pay-as-you-go" basis by increased social security payroll taxes. One-fourth of those responding favored funding social security benefits from general tax increases, and another quarter favored a simple reduction in benefits. Responses to this question were almost identical between students and adults.

It is obvious from the questionnaire results that the taxpayers are interested in and concerned with key issues before the Congress. Their responses will prove invaluable to me as I study legislative proposals relating to these various issues. I am grateful to each and every respondent for taking the time to be actively involved in the process of our representative form of government.

The results of the poll are as follows:

QUESTIONNAIRE

RESPONSES BY ADULTS

(Question and answers in percentages)

1. Do you believe that public employees such as firemen, policemen, and teachers should have the right to strike?

Yes, 19.84. No, 80.15.

2. Would you favor legislation legalizing the use of marijuana?

Yes, 14.98. No, 85.01.

3. Do you favor continued ownership and control over the Panama Canal Zone?

Yes, 95.32. No, 4.67.

4. Do you favor legislation requiring handgun owners to register their handguns with the Federal government?

Yes, 40.89. No, 59.10.

5. Should the Federal government provide jobs for anyone who wants to work and cannot find employment, even if to do so would mean a larger Federal deficit and higher income taxes?

Yes, 21.07. No, 78.92.

6. Should the U.S. maintain intelligence operations in foreign countries?

Yes, 92.44. No, 7.55.

7. Do you favor a national health insurance program for catastrophic illnesses to be financed by higher Federal payroll taxes?

Yes, 31.79. No, 68.20.

8. Do you believe that an individual should be allowed to register to vote by mail instead of registering in person before the registrar?

Yes, 20.07. No, 79.92.

9. Do you believe that Federal judges should be appointed for a term of years rather than for life?

Yes, 93.87. No, 6.12.

10. Do you feel that the activities and expenditures of the CIA should be made public?

Yes, 25.42. No, 74.57.

11. Social Security authorities have testified to the Congress that by 1980 there will not be enough money left in the Social Security trust fund to continue benefits at the current level. In view of this, which of the following actions would you favor? Check one.

A. The S. S. fund should be replenished on a pay-as-you-go basis by increased Social Security payroll taxes.

Yes, 49.76.

B. The S.S. fund should be replenished from general tax revenues, even if it means a larger Federal deficit or higher income taxes.

Yes, 24.50.

C. Present levels of benefits should be cut.

Yes, 25.64.

STUDENT RESPONSES

1. Do you believe that public employees such as teachers, firemen and policemen should have the right to strike?

Yes, 75.0. No, 24.1.

2. Would you favor legislation legalizing the use of marijuana?

Yes, 43.6. No, 56.4.

3. Do you favor the United States retaining continued ownership and control of the Panama Canal Zone?

Yes, 88.0. No, 12.0.

4. Do you favor legislation requiring handgun owners to register their handguns with the Federal government?

Yes, 76.5. No, 23.5.

5. Should the Federal government provide jobs for anyone who wants to work and cannot find employment, even if to do so would mean a larger Federal deficit or higher income taxes?

Yes, 51.3. No, 48.2.

6. Should the US maintain intelligence operations in foreign countries?

Yes, 79.3. No, 20.2.

7. Do you favor a national health insurance program for catastrophic illnesses to be financed by higher Federal payroll taxes?

Yes, 58.2. No, 41.8.

8. Do you believe that an individual should be allowed to register to vote by mail instead of registering in person before the registrar?

Yes, 47.6. No, 52.4.

9. Do you believe that Federal judges should be appointed for a term of years rather than for life?

Yes, 81.2. No, 18.8.

10. Do you feel that the activities and expenditures of the CIA should be made public?

Yes, 52.3. No, 47.2.

11. Social Security authorities have testified to the Congress that by 1980 there will not be enough money left in the Social Security trust fund to continue benefits at the current level. In view of this, which of the following actions would you favor?
Check one.

A. The SS fund should be replenished on a pay-as-you-go basis by increased Social Security payroll taxes.

Yes, 49.2.

B. The SS fund should be replenished from general tax revenues even if it means a larger federal deficit or higher income taxes.

Yes, 35.9.

C. Present levels of benefits should be cut.

Yes, 21.9.

ARTICLE APPEARED
ON PAGE IV-151

CHICAGO TRIBUNE
8 JULY 1976

National briefs

Belli comes to Ruby's defense

SAN FRANCISCO—Attorney Melvin Belli says it is not true that Jack Ruby met secretly with Fidel Castro in 1963 to plot the assassination of President John Kennedy. Belli, who knew Ruby as a friend and client, says Ruby was "an intensely loyal American who worshiped Jack Kennedy." Ruby, a Dallas nightclub owner, killed Lee Harvey Oswald, the man believed to have assassinated Kennedy, in Dallas on Nov. 24, 1963. A former CIA agent has charged that Ruby met Castro while in Cuba trying to make a drug deal. But Belli said Ruby never saw Castro and called the allegations "CIA bull."

Batting Down the Story

Criminal lawyer Melvin Belli says a report that Jack Ruby once conferred with Fidel Castro about the possibility of assassinating President Kennedy is ludicrous. Belli said the man who shot Lee Harvey Oswald "was impossible to work with. No one is his right mind would hire him to do anything." Belli, who once represented Ruby, added: "He was immature in judgment, erratic and emotionally involved. Within five minutes of meeting him, you knew he couldn't carry out any plan."



He was just a fellow trying to scrounge and get by." Furthermore, said Belli, "he worshiped Jack Kennedy." Belli did say, however, Ruby may have been in Cuba six months before the assassination.

—John McKeown

Information Law Priority Requires Proof of Urgency

United Press International

A three-judge federal court ruled yesterday that persons applying for information from government agencies must show an "exceptional need or urgency" before they can obtain data ahead of other persons.

All three judges voted to reverse a ruling by District Judge Aubrey Robinson ordering the FBI to immediately turn over any documents relating to former Acting FBI Director L. Patrick Gray's role in the Watergate cover-up.

The FBI said it would produce any information it could under the Freedom of Information Act, but placed the request behind 5,137 other data applications received earlier.

The Gray information was sought by a group of George Washington University law students calling themselves "Open America." Aside from the information, they wanted to test portions of the FOIA

requiring disclosure on request within 10 days.

TRANSMITTAL SLIP		DATE
TO: DCI		8 JULY 1976
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	Executive Registry
		76-2813
REMARKS:		
TO: BX-3		
FROM: A/DCI		
ROOM NO.	BUILDING	EXTENSION

FORM NO. 241
1 FEB 55

REPLACES FORM 39-8
WHICH MAY BE USED.

(47)

(EXECUTIVE REGISTRY FILE)

OLC

ROUTING AND RECORD SHEET

SUBJECT: (Optional)			Executive Registry 76-2813/1				
FROM:		EXTENSION <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> NO.		DATE			
Acting Legislative Counsel				8 July 1976			
TO: (Officer designation, room number, and building)	DATE		OFFICER'S INITIALS	COMMENTS (Number each comment to show from whom to whom. Draw a line across column after each comment.)			
	RECEIVED	FORWARDED					
1. Director				<p>To follow up our discussion of this morning, I am attaching for your information the full text of remarks made by Representative Anderson on 1 July concerning reform (with a capital R) in the House of Representatives, including intelligence oversight.</p> <p>I am also attaching the Opinion Poll conducted by Representative Ashbrook's office which included a question on the CIA.</p> <div style="border: 1px solid black; width: 200px; height: 80px; margin: 10px auto;"></div> <p style="text-align: right;">Acting Legislative Counsel STATINTL</p>			
2.							
3.							
4.							
5.							
6.							
7.							
8.							
9.							
10.							
11.							
12.						<div style="position: relative;"> ALC <div style="border: 1px solid black; padding: 2px;"> (EXECUTIVE REGISTRY FILE) </div> </div>	
13.							
14.							
15.							